

AUG 02 2006

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROSEBELE E. MAGANA CISNEROS;
PEDRO MAGANA LARIOS,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-71297

Agency Nos. A76-671-872
A76-671-874

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006**

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Rosebele E. Magana Cisneros and his son Pedro Magana Larios, natives and
citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals'

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“BIA”) order affirming without opinion an immigration judge’s decision (“IJ”) denying their applications for cancellation of removal. To the extent we have jurisdiction, it is conferred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the IJ’s discretionary determination that the petitioners failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 929 (9th Cir. 2005).

Contrary to the petitioners’ contention, the agency’s interpretation of the hardship standard falls within the broad range authorized by the statute. *See Ramirez-Perez v. Ashcroft*, 336 F.3d 1001, 1004-1006 (9th Cir. 2003).

The petitioners’ contention that the BIA erred in streamlining their case is foreclosed by *Falcon Carriche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 852 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.